

## LOST IN EDITION? CONSIDERATIONS ON SOME SOURCES OF MENANDER'S *HYPOBOLIMAIOS*

MATTIA DE POLI

ALMA MATER STUDIORUM – UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

[mattia.depoli2@unibo.it](mailto:mattia.depoli2@unibo.it)

### 1. Fragments and sediments: Modern scholarship and the matter of sources

In considering Menander's *Hypobolimaïos e Agroïkos*, one might be surprised to find no mention of some literary and iconographic sources in the more recent edition of Menander's fragmentary plays by KASSEL/AUSTIN (1998, 231-238). Earlier editors of this Greek playwright – from MEINEKE (1823, 172-173; 1841, 216) to EDMONDS (1961, 740-741)<sup>1</sup> – and, more generally, modern scholars – from GRAUERT (1833, 76-77) down to WEBSTER (1950, 100-101; 1974, 152-153) and GAISER (1988, 178-180)<sup>2</sup> – had also considered Varro's treatise *De re rustica* (2,11,11) and Cicero's speech *Pro Roscio Amerino* (45-46) as sources for the plot of Menander's *Hypobolimaïos*. Furthermore, GAISER (1988) offered an improved interpretation of a marble relief preserved at the National Archeological Museum in Naples (inv. 6687) as depicting a scene from Menander's *Hypobolimaïos*.

The problem with the Latin texts lies primarily in the relationship between this Menandrian play and the *Hypobolimaëus* by Caecilius Statius: both Varro and Cicero refer only to the latter<sup>3</sup>, and their words might be useful for reconstructing the Greek comedy

---

<sup>1</sup> See also KOCK 1888, 137-174; KOERTE/THIERFELDER 1959, 146-147.

<sup>2</sup> See also KOKOLAKIS 1962, 104-107.

<sup>3</sup> Varro *Rust.* 2,11,11: *usum apud antiquos quoque Graecos fuisse apparet, quod ... in comoediis ... ut apud Caecilium in Hypobolimaëo habet adulescens*; Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 46: *senex ille Caecilianus*.

only if we assume that Menander's *Hypobolimaïos* was the model for Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus*<sup>4</sup>. Gaiser's suggestions regarding the marble relief of Naples are again based on this assumption, but in this case the main question concerns the identification of the two old men depicted on the left.

This paper offers a reappraisal of these three sources, omitted by Kassel and Austin, in order to understand the reasons for their exclusion and, with regard to the marble relief, to question their decision. First, I will discuss the double title of this Menandrian play and the title *Hypobolimaëus*, which was probably used by Caecilius in more than one of his plays, emphasizing that Menander was only one of several possible Greek models for the Roman comic poet, since other plays titled *Hypobolimaïos* were also written by other playwrights between the 4<sup>th</sup> and the 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BC. Then, I will compare the text of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* (1,10,18), which explicitly concerns Menander's *Hypobolimaïos*, with those of Varro and Cicero, who refer to Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus*, in order to highlight the differences between the Greek and the Roman plays. Finally, I will demonstrate that the marble relief of Naples corresponds to the characters and plot of the Menandrian comedy, as attested by Quintilian.

## 2. Titles and plots: Menander, Caecilius... and the others.

*a) The double title of Menander's Hypobolimaïos does not guarantee that the play revolved around a pair of youths.*

According to Photius (π 567 Th.) and the *Suda* (π 959 A.), this Menandrian play had a double title: *Hypobolimaïos*<sup>5</sup> e *Agroïkos*<sup>6</sup> (*The supposititious or The rustic*). KOKOLAKIS (1962, 11 and n. 9) claimed that it certainly ("ἀσφαλῶς") refers to two different characters of the play, similarly to another double title, *Arrhephoros* e *Auletris* (or *Auletrides*), basing his view on Webster, but his arguments are unconvincing. WEBSTER (1950, 100) indeed wrote that "the alternatives *probably* represent two characters as in the *Arrhephoros* or *Flute-Girl*"<sup>7</sup>. Moreover, the second component of a double title could also have been

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. MEINEKE 1823, 172: "e Caecilio Hypobolimaëo, ad Menandreae fabulae imitationem composito"; KOCK 1888, 137-138 (after quoting Varro and Cicero): "quae ad Menandream non minus quam ad Caecilianam pertinent"; KOERTE/THIERFELDER 1959, 147: "ea quae Cicero et Varro de *Hypobolimaëo* Caecilii narrant e Menandri comoedia sumpta esse admodum veri simile est".

<sup>5</sup> Here, I do not deal with other variants of this title, also attested at the plural masculine form (*Hypobolimaïoi*) and at the singular feminine form (*Hypobolimaïa*). Usually, the scholars consider them to be mistakes: see e.g. KOKOLAKIS 1962, 10. For a similar corruption, see KONSTANTAKOS 2000, 10-11, about the title of Antiphanes' *Agroïkos*.

<sup>6</sup> *Agroïkos* is attested as the title of a Menandrian play also by *P. Oxy.* 2462: see Turner 1962, 103-104; CGFP fr. 104. It was probably a school exercise or the list of a private library: see Corbato 1965, 36-37.

<sup>7</sup> "Probably" has been italicised by me. The British scholar went further and developed this suggestion only in a later study: see the plot of Menander's *Hypobolimaïos* in WEBSTER (1974, 152-153).

added later by a grammarian, either (1) to provide additional information about the main character of the play – an example is Alexis' *Dorkis* [or *Rhodion*] e *Poppyzousa* (*Dorkis* [or *Rhodion*] or *The woman who smacks the lips*)<sup>8</sup> – or (2) to distinguish that play from others with the same title, such as those by Alexis and Philemon among the most famous playwrights<sup>9</sup>. The *didaskalia* of Menander's *Dyskolos* also informs us that the play had a secondary title, *Misanthropos*, which is simply a synonym referring to the same character. In fact, the adjectives *Hypobolimaïos* and *Agroïkos* do not mean the same thing, but they may both highlight different aspects of a single character. Therefore, the double title is not, in itself, evidence of the involvement of two young men – one being a supposititious son, the other raised in the countryside – in the plot of this Menandrian play. SPALDING (1798, 221) offered a simpler explanation, suggesting that a supposititious son, raised in a noble family, reveals his true nature through his rustic behaviour:

duplicis autem tituli rationem probabilem sic reddi posse opinor, si is, qui in nobiliorem gentem parentum fraude est suppositus, mira rusticitate ortum suum prodat, cuius argumenti sunt Francogallorum Comoediae.

b) *There is no conclusive evidence that Menander's Hypobolimaïos was the Greek model for a play by Caecilius Statius, titled Hypobolimaëus.*

*Hypobolimaïos* was the title of several plays written in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BC by different Greek authors – not only Menander, but also Alexis, Philemon, Eudoxus, and possibly Cratinus iunior<sup>10</sup>. As for Roman comedy, Caecilius is known to have authored at least two<sup>11</sup> (or possibly three<sup>12</sup>) plays titled *Hypobolimaëus*. Nevertheless, modern scholars

<sup>8</sup> On the double title of this play by Alexis, see ARNOTT 1996, 176-177; STAMA 2014, 139-140. Probably, the double title of Alexis' *Agonis e Hippiskos* alludes to a *hetaira* and an object (a jewel or a small clothing) of herself: see ARNOTT 1996, 51; STAMA 2014, 54-55.

<sup>9</sup> On the origin of a double title for a Greek comedy, see KONSTANTAKOS 2000, 11-15, with further bibliography.

<sup>10</sup> Poll. 7,211 also cites a play called *Hypobolimaïos* by Cratinus iunior, but KASSEL/AUSTIN (1983, 344) collected this text as fr. 11 from *Pseudhypobolimaïos*, just as if he had written one only play on this topic: see MEINEKE 1840, 378. On Cratinus as the author of a play called *Hypobolimaïos*, see KOCK 1888, 137-138, and KOERTE/THIERFELDER 1959, 146-147.

<sup>11</sup> Grauert 1833, 75-80, argued that Caecilius had wrote only one play titled *Hypobolimaëus* (see esp. 80: "quae quum ita sint, demonstravi, ut opinor, unam tantum Caecilii fabulam fuisse nomine *Hypobolimaëi* vel *Hypobolimaëi* (sive) *Rastrariae insignitam*") and just distinguished a second play titled *Aeschinus* (79). See also e.g. RITSCHL 1845, xiv-xv: "duas, nisi fallimur, Ὑποβολιμαίους verterat Caecilius"; RIBBECK 1898, 54-56; WARMINGTON 1935, 494 n. a).

<sup>12</sup> See Scaliger in GRAUERT 1833, 75: "distingendum est inter tres Caecilii fabulas simili nomine insignitas: *Hypobolimaëum Chaerestratum*, *Hypobolimaëum Aeschinum*, *Hypobolimaëam Rastrariam*"; but the latter title must be male, i.e. *Hypobolimaëus Rastraria*: see GRAUERT 1833, 77-80; RITSCHL 1845, xiv.

have usually cited Menander as the sole Greek model for all of them<sup>13</sup>. RITSCHL (1845, xv) and RAPISARDA (1939, 101) proposed two different hypotheses on this matter, which scholarship has often overlooked. The former suggested that Caecilius wrote two plays with this title, one based on Menander and the other on Philemon or Alexis. In contrast, Rapisarda outlined a three-step rewriting process: Philemon's *Hypobolimaïos* was the model for Menander's version, which then served as the source for Caecilius<sup>14</sup>. But what about Alexis' *Hypobolimaïos*? Generally, if we assume that Caecilius drew on two (or three) distinct Greek models for his *Hypobolimaïi* (though we cannot exclude the possibility that they were different revisions<sup>15</sup> of the adaptation of a single Greek play), there is no compelling reason to assume that Menander's *Hypobolimaïos* must have been one of them. And even if it were so, it remains unclear why it should be considered the source for the specific *Hypobolimaëus* written by Caecilius and referred by Varro and Cicero.

Before analysing the three Latin texts concerning either Menander's *Hypobolimaïos* or Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus*, I will examine the arguments scholars have offered regarding the relationship between these plays – if, indeed, they have offered any. In many cases, scholars merely assert that Menander's *Hypobolimaïos* was the Greek model of Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus*, without substantiating their claims<sup>16</sup>. For example, MEINEKE (1823, 172), after quoting Cicero's *Pro Roscio Amerino* (16 [= 45-46]) regarding Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus*, simply concluded that the situation described was an imitation of Menander's plot, consistent with fr. I R.<sup>3</sup> of Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus Chaerestratus*, as quoted by Festus (*Gloss. Lat. [De verb. sign.]* p. 180,30-32)<sup>17</sup>. GRAUERT (1833, 76) similarly asserted this connection without further elaboration<sup>18</sup>. A few pages later, he noted that fr. II R.<sup>3</sup> of Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus Rastraria* is similar in general meaning to Men. fr. 382 K./A.<sup>19</sup>, and that the misogyny expressed by fr. I R.<sup>3</sup> of Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus Chaerestratus* also appears in many Menandrian fragments such as fr. 378 and fr. 374 K./A. from his *Hypobolimaïos*<sup>20</sup>. More recently, GAISER (1988, 178) has considered Cicero's *Pro Roscio*

<sup>13</sup> See e.g. RIBBECK 1888, 10-11; FAIDER 1908, 334-335 n. 3; GUARDÌ 1974, 139-140. WARMINGTON 1935, 494 n. a): "all the titles probably belong to one play adapted from Menander's Ὑποβολιμαῖος ἢ Ἀγροικός, whereas *The Changeling Aeschinus* [...] was another play altogether". BRUZZESE 2011, 134: "è molto probabile, ma non assolutamente certo, che dietro queste rielaborazioni ceciliane ci fosse il dramma menandro". (italics mine).

<sup>14</sup> See also TERZAGHI 1912, 102.

<sup>15</sup> See TERZAGHI 1912, 100-101; GUARDÌ 1974, 139-140.

<sup>16</sup> See e.g. SKUTSCH 1899, 1190-1192. GUARDÌ 1974, 140: "L'originale (o uno degli originali) di Cecilio è quasi certamente lo Ὑποβολιμαῖος ἢ Ἀγροικός di Menandro". He also suggested a plot of Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus* based on Quint. 1,10,18.

<sup>17</sup> "Haec e Caecilii *Hypobolimaëo*, ad Menandereae fabulae imitationem composita, petita esse docet Festus [...]: *Caecilius in Hypobolimaëo Chaerestrato: 'Nam ista quidem noxa mulieris magis quam viri est'*" (the words *mulieris ... est* are under debate, but the general meaning is quite clear). See also MEINEKE 1841, 216.

<sup>18</sup> "Iam vero Caecilius expressit *Hypobolimaëum* e Menandri fabula Ὑποβολιμαῖος ἢ Ἀγροικός".

<sup>19</sup> Also FRASSINETTI 1979, 82, stressed the similarity of this Greek fragment and the Latin one.

<sup>20</sup> See GRAUERT 1833, 81-82.

*Amerino* as a source of Menander's *Hypobolimaïos*, claiming that the orator had in mind Caecilius' Latin translation of the Menandrian play, but he offered no further detail<sup>21</sup>.

In the field of Latin scholarship, RIBBECK (1898, 55) acknowledged that Quintilian refers only to Menander, but he warned other scholars against disregarding this as a source also for Caecilius' play. Ribbeck argued that Quintilian, who emphasises the importance of musical education and cites both Greek and Roman authors, explicitly mentions Menander's *Hypobolimaïos* (i.e. the Greek source) but may imply also Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus* (i.e. the Latin adaptation)<sup>22</sup>. Commenting on fr. III R.<sup>3</sup> of Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus sive Subditivos*, RIBBECK (1898, 56) suggested that the *persona loquens* is the Old Man mentioned by Quintilian, reproaching the behaviour of his supposititious son who has become aware of his origins. On the other hand, KOERTE/THIERFELDER (1959, 147) maintained that what Cicero and Varro say about Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus* was plausibly derived from Menander's *Hypobolimaïos*<sup>23</sup>. But plausibility is not the same as proof.

KOKOLAKIS (1962, 102-103) presented four arguments intended to demonstrate that Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus* was an adaptation of Menander's *Hypobolimaïos* for the Roman stage, possibly retaining some details from the original. However, none of these arguments are conclusive or irrefutable. In his second argument, Kokolakis pointed out that Menander's *Plokion* and *Synepheboi* were certainly the models for Caecilius' *Plocium* and *Synephebi*, as confirmed by Aulus Gellius (*N.A.* 2,23) and Cicero (*Fin.* 1,2,4, *De opt. gen. orat.* 6,18). But then, why do they not mention Menander's *Hypobolimaïos* and Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus*? The "certain imitation" ("βεβαία μίμησις") of those Menandrian plays by Caecilius does not prove that he consistently used Menander as a model. The Greek source of Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus* is even more doubtful if we accept – this being Kokolakis' fourth argument – that Menander's *Hypobolimaïos* was well known in Rome, as attested by Quintilian (10,1,70). Kokolakis' third argument rests on the idea that the Latin comedy "clearly" ("προφανῶς") bore the double title *Hypobolimaëus Rastraria* as an imitation of the Greek double title *Hypobolimaïos e Agroikos*<sup>24</sup>. However, apart from the Latin suffix *-aria*, which denotes "a comedy about" (as Plautus' *Cistellaria*, i.e. *The Casket Comedy*), *rastrum* ("rake") is not synonymous with *agroikos* ("rustic"). While both are linked to rural life, one refers to an object, the other to a person. We may assume that a youth's recognition plays a central role in both plays, but *Rastraria* likely highlights the means of recognition, whereas *Agroikos* emphasises the youth's nature or demeanor. Finally, in his

<sup>21</sup> "Cicerone, tenendo presente la traduzione latina della nostra commedia menandrea ad opera di Cecilio Stazio, riferisce che [...]".

<sup>22</sup> "Menandrum' sane dicit Quintilianus I 10,18 [...] sed inde cave concludas in Caeciliana fabula eum locum non extitisse: cum enim in eo sit Quintilianus, ut antiquis etiam temporibus musicam demonstret maximo in honore fuisse, testes primum laudat Graecos homines, tum demum ad Romanorum disciplinam transit". RIBBECK (1888, 10-11) took Quintilian as a source for the plot of Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus Rastraria*.

<sup>23</sup> Quoted above, n. 4.

<sup>24</sup> See also KOCK 1888, 137-138.

first argument, Kokolakis noted that thirty of Caecilius' plays bear Greek titles, fifteen of which are shared with Menander's comedies, and eleven of which are attested only for Menander. If *Hypobolimaesus* were among this last group, it would strengthen the case for Menander as the Greek model. But this is not the case: we have already noted that Alexis, Philemon, Eudoxus, and possibly Cratinus iunior also wrote plays with this title.

Fifty years earlier, SKUTSCH (1899, 1189-1192), in his article on Caecilius Statius in the *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, grouped *Hypobolimaesus Chaerestratus* with *Plocium* and *Synephebi*, claiming that all were derived from Menander's plays of the same titles<sup>25</sup>. However, our sources – Cicero and Aulus Gellius – say nothing about a connection between Menander's *Hypobolimaios* and Caecilius' *Hypobolimaesus*. Later, at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, FAIDER (1908, 316-317) included the *Hypobolimaiei* – namely *Hypobolimaesus sive Subditivos*, *Hypobolimaesus Chaerestratus*, *Hypobolimaesus Rastraria*, and *Hypobolimaesus Aeschinus* – among the plays of Caecilius whose titles only match those of Menander, such as *Imbrii* and *Synaristosae*. Yet this classification is misleading. Faider distinguished them from plays whose titles are shared among multiple Greek playwrights, such as *Epiclesos* (Antiphanes, Alexis, Diodorus, Diphilus, and Menander), *Karine* (Antiphanes and Menander), and *Titthe* (Alexis and Menander; see also Eubulus' *Titthai*). But the case of *Hypobolimaesus* is no different. Thus, Faider's conclusion about Caecilius' preference for Menander should be reconsidered. It is likely that both Skutsch's opinion about Caecilius' *Hypobolimaesus Chaerestratus* and its supposed Greek model, as well as Faider's classification, were based on the assumption of Meineke and Grauert. As demonstrated, however, the affinities between the Greek and Latin fragments are too weak to support such conclusions.

Finally, the *scholium Bembinum* to Ter. *Eun.* 39 mentions a play of Menander called *Suppositicius*, which is a Latin translation of the Greek word *hypobolimaios*: (*puerum supponi*) [*ha*]nc fabulam in Menandro | [*inueni*]mus, hoc est *Suppositicium*. But the scholiast does not refer to Caecilius or his *Hypobolimaesus* (or *Hypobolimaiei*). It is merely a suggestion by the modern editor, MOUNTFORD (1934, 15), that “perhaps the schol. is based on a tradition that Terence intended to refer to Caecilius in this line”. None of the ancient sources actually link Menander's *Hypobolimaios* to Caecilius' *Hypobolimaesus* (or to any of his plays bearing that title).

<sup>25</sup> “Diesem vorzug verdankt Caecilius gewiss dem Umstande, dass er sich seiner Vorbilder vorzugsweise bei Menander suchte [...]; von etwa vierzig (oder, nach Ausschluss der lateinischen, einigen dreissig) Titeln seiner Stücke, finden sich sechzehn auch bei Menander, elf nur bei diesem; sicher stehts Nachahmung des Menander für *Hypobolimaesus Chaerestratus*, *Plocium* und *Sinephebi* (Cic. de opt. gen. orat. 18; de fin. I 14)”.

c) A reappraisal of the Latin sources shows that what Quintilian says about Menander's *Hypobolimaos* does not overlap with what Cicero (and Varro) say about Caecilius' *Hypobolimaos*.

Many scholars have attempted to reconstruct the plot of both Menander's *Hypobolimaos* and Caecilius' *Hypobolimaos*, drawing on details from Varro's *De re rustica* (2,11,11), Cicero's *Pro Roscio Amerino* (45-46), and Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* (1,10,18). However, they do not agree on whether the son beloved by his father is the one living with him in the city or the one residing in the countryside<sup>26</sup>. A reappraisal of these sources is thus necessary, not only to clarify this aspect but also to assess the consistency between the material relating to Menander's play and that of Caecilius'.

1) Varro, *De re rustica* 2,11,11:

*neque non quaedam nationes harum pellibus sunt vestitae, ut in Gaetulia et in Sardinia. cuius usum apud antiquos quoque Graecos fuisse apparet, quod in tragoediis senes ab hac pelle vocantur diphtheriae et in comoediis qui in rustico opere morantur, ut apud Caecilium in Hypobolimaos habet adulescens, apud Terentium in Heautontimorumenos senex.*

Some barbarous people, too, use their skins for clothing, as, for instance, in Gaetulia and Sardinia. That this usage obtained among the ancient Greeks also is evident from the fact that the old men who appear in the tragedies get their name of *diphtheriae* from the goat skin, and in comedies those who are engaged in rustic labour, such as the young man in Caecilius's *Hypobolimaos*, and the old man in Terence's *Heautontimorumenos*. (transl. HOOPER/ASH 1934)

Varro informs us only that one of the characters in Caecilius' *Hypobolimaos* is a young man who worked in the countryside and wore goatskin.

2) Cicero, *Pro Roscio Amerino* 45-46:

*at enim, cum duos filios haberet, alterum a se non dimittebat, alterum ruri esse patiebatur. quaeso, Eruci, ut hoc in bonam partem accipias; non enim exprobandi causa, sed commonendi gratia dicam. [46] si tibi fortuna non dedit ut patre certo nascere ex quo intellegere posses qui animus patrius in liberos esset, at natura certe dedit ut humanitatis non parum haberes; eo accessit studium doctrinae ut ne a litteris quidem alienus esses. ecquid tandem tibi videtur, ut ad fabulas veniamus, senex*

<sup>26</sup> Some scholars support the opinion that the beloved son is the one who lives by his father (GRAUERT 1833, 76-77; FAIDER 1908, 335, who consider Eutychus as the supposititious son; GUARDÌ 1974, 140-141), while others claim that the beloved son is the one who lives in the country (WEBSTER 1950, 100-101; WEBSTER 1974, 152-153; FRASSINETTI 1979, 81-83; GAISER 1988, 178).

ille Caecilianus minoris facere Eutychum, filium rusticum, quam illum alterum, Chaerestratum? – nam, ut opinor, hoc nomine est – alterum in urbe secum honoris causa habere, alterum rus supplicii causa relegasse?

Well, but, you say, whereas Roscius had two sons, he never sent one of them away, but left the other to live in the country. I beg you, Erucius, to take what I am going to say in good part, for I do not mean to reproach you, but to remind you. [46] If it has not been your lot to be born of a father about whom there is no mistake, from whom you could have learnt what was the feeling of a father towards his children, at least nature has given you no small share of humanity, combined with a taste for learning, so that you are not a stranger to literature. To take an example from the stage, I ask you whether you really think that the old man in the play of Caecilius thinks less of Eutychus, who lives in the country, than of the other, Chaerestratus (I think that was his name); that he keeps the one with him in the city as a token of esteem, while he has sent the other into the country as a punishment. (transl. FREESE 1956)

Cicero's purpose, as a defence lawyer, is to argue that the defendant had no motive to hate and murder his father (39-47). Sextus Roscius (the father) had two sons and loved both: he kept one in the city and allowed the other (Sextus Roscius, the son) to live in the countryside. Cicero contends that this arrangement was not punitive for the latter but reflective of a responsible *pater familias* who also held the country-dwelling son in high regard. The plot of Caecilius' *Hypobolimaesus* (*Chaerestratus*) supports Cicero's point: the old man does not despise the *filius rusticus*, i.e. the son living in the countryside. Importantly, Cicero does not claim that the father loves one son more than the other, or that the rural son is his only true son, though the latter might be inferred if *Chaerestratus* is the "supposititious" child of the title. However, Cicero's main focus is not this plot detail, but rather Eutychus, the familiar *comicus adulescens* (47), who resembles the defendant in that he lives in the countryside. No second father is mentioned, and while we might infer his presence, the plot may primarily revolve around the two young men and their relationship with the old man who raised them.

### 3) Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 1,10,18:

*Transeamus igitur id quoque, quod grammaticae quondam ac musicae iunctae fuerunt; siquidem Archytas atque Euenus etiam subiectam grammaticen musicae putaverunt, et eosdem utriusque rei praeceptores fuisse cum Sophron ostendit, mimorum quidem scriptor sed quem Plato adeo probavit, ut suppositos capiti libros eius, [18] cum moreretur, habuisse credatur, tum Eupolis, apud quem Prodamus et musicen et litteras docet, et Maricas, qui est Hyperbolus, nihil se ex musica scire nisi litteras confitetur. Aristophanes quoque non uno libro sic institui pueros antiquitus solitos esse demonstrat, et apud Menandrum in Hypobolimaeso senex, qui reposcenti filium patri, velut rationem impendiorum quae in educationem contulerit exponens, psaltis se et geometris multa dicit dedisse.*



So let us pass over the fact that *grammaticē* and music were once united, if it is true that Archytas and Euenus regarded *grammaticē* as subordinate to music, and that the identity of the teachers of the two arts is shown both by Sophron, a writer of mimes whom nevertheless Plato approved so warmly that he is believed to have died with Sophron's books under his pillow, and by Eupolis, in whose play Prodamos teaches both music and letters and Maricas (that is to say, Hyperbolus) confesses to knowing nothing of music except his letters. Aristophanes also, in more than a work, shows that boys were brought up in music in the old times; and the old man in Menander's *Hypobolimaieus*, who, in giving an account to the boy's real father (who is claiming him back) of the expenses he has incurred on his education, says that he has paid large sums to "teachers of the lyre, and teachers of geometry". (transl. RUSSELL 2001)

In this passage, Quintilian discusses the importance of music in the education of an orator, offering several historical and literary examples. These include: a) the views of philosophers and poets like Archytas and Euenus, who regarded music as superior to grammar; b) the existence of teachers skilled in both disciplines, as seen in Sophron and Eupolis; c) literary examples from Aristophanes and Menander (namely the old man in Menander's *Hypobolimaieus*), which illustrate the role of music in early education. Quintilian mentions three characters from *Hypobolimaieus*: the *filius* ("son"), the *senex* ("old man", *i.e.* the foster father), and the *pater* (the natural "father"). In the scene described, the old man explains to the natural father, who demands his son back, that he has spent heavily on the boy's education, including music and geometry lessons. This suggests that the boy was raised in the city by the old man, while – based on the alternate title *Agroikos* – we may surmise that the biological father and his son were of rural origin.

In conclusion, the sources for Caecilius' *Hypobolimaieus* reveal three characters in the play: two young men and an old man. Varro mentions only a young man (*adulescens*) living in the countryside, who may correspond to the *filius rusticus* referred to by Cicero and named Eutychus. He is contrasted with another son living in the city, likely named Chaerestratus. That the latter is the supposititious son of the title can only be conjectured. Indeed, Chaerestratus might correspond to the *hypobolimaieus* of Menander's play<sup>27</sup>, but in the Greek version the presence of a son living in the countryside is not attested, at least according to the only extant source for Menander's *Hypobolimaieus*. By contrast, Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* also presents three characters in the Greek play, but in this case they consist of two old men and one young. It may be assumed that the *senex* mentioned here is the same person as the *senex* referenced by Cicero. But what about the *filius rusticus* who lives in the countryside? It is not surprising that each source emphasises the

<sup>27</sup> It is quite certain that the name of the supposititious son in the Greek comedy was Moschion, and it was probably changed into Chaerestratus by Caecilius, but this is not surprising: see BROWN 2016, 69.

aspects most relevant to its own argumentative context and focuses on different narrative elements. However, a comparison between the texts of Cicero and Quintilian does not provide any conclusive evidence for a direct connection between Menander's *Hypobolimaïos* and Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus*.

### 3. Two iconographic sources of Menander's *Hypobolimaïos*?

The marble relief in Naples (Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli, inv. 6687; fig. 1) depicts the same scene as a cameo in Geneva (Musée d'art et d'histoire de Genève, inv. 1974/21133; fig. 2), although the latter lacks background scenery. Both likely derive from an original painting dating back to the 4<sup>th</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BC<sup>28</sup>. The scene features five characters, four of whom wear comic masks<sup>29</sup>:

- a) a mild old man wears the mask of a "leading old man" (*hegemon presbytes* = no. 3 in Pollux's list) and restrains the angry old man (b) beside him;
- b) the angry old man wears the mask of an "old man with wavy hair" and a long beard<sup>30</sup> (*presbytes makropogon e episeion* = no. 4), and appears to be attacking the young man on the right, punishing and beating him with a staff;
- c) the central figure is a *hetaira* playing the aulos (*auletris*), probably coming from a symposium; she is the only character without a mask and is presumably mute;
- d) a drunken youth, resembling the "second youth with wavy hair" (*deuteros episeistos [neaniskos]* = no. 16), is dancing while being supported by a slave;
- e) the slave is leading his drunken master (i.e. *episeistos hēgemōn [doulos]* = no. 27).

The angry old man is dressed in a *himation* with a distinctive fringe at the bottom, which has been identified with a *katonake* by BREIN (1972, 232-233). GAISER (1988, 174) supported this interpretation and identified the figure as a *senex rusticus*, the natural father of the "rustic" *hypobolimaïos* in Menander's play of the same name. The relief bears no inscription, and the identification of the characters remains hypothetical. The connection

<sup>28</sup> See BREIN 1972; GREEN 1985, 466-468; GAISER 1988, 167-170.

<sup>29</sup> More accurate descriptions of this scene are in WEBSTER 1956, 75-76; WEBSTER 1961, 195 (where the numbers of the masks of the two old men are in the wrong order); BREIN 1972, 227; BERNABÒ BREA 1981, 137; GREEN 1985, 466-468; GAISER 1988, 168-169 and *passim*. The names and numbers of the masks correspond to those in WEBSTER 1949.

<sup>30</sup> The long beard of the wavy-haired old man is evident in the cameo, while it is broken in the Naples relief: see GAISER 1988, 175 and n. 24.

with Menander is even more speculative. However, in my view, another iconographic source could serve as a missing link: the decoration of a silver cup from the Boscoreale treasure (Musée du Louvre, Département des Antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines, inv. Bj 1924/MNC 1980 = Men. test. 34 K./A.; fig 3). An inscription identifies one of the skeletons as Menander, and the mask he holds in his left hand – “with flat nose, wide lips, and a wreath” – “seems to be the rustic at a party, perhaps the rustic who gave its alternative title to the famous *Hypobolimaïos*”<sup>31</sup>. This mask closely resembles the one worn by the drunken young man with wavy hair in the Naples relief: he raises his right hand and holds a wreath, typically worn by symposiasts, just as in the mask depicted on the silver cup. If we accept that the Naples relief depicts a scene from Menander’s *Hypobolimaïos*, the mild old man must be identified as the *senex* who raised the supposititious child as his own son. In that case, the three characters mentioned by Quintilian – the *pater*, the *senex*, and the supposititious *filius* – are all represented in this scene, while the slave is likely another speaking character of the play.

#### 4. Conclusions.

Over the past two centuries, many scholars have attempted to reconstruct the plot of Menander’s *Hypobolimaïos*, combining the details provided by Quintilian with those concerning Caecilius’ *Hypobolimaëus* (*Chaerestatus*) as discussed by Cicero and Varro. The result is a plot strikingly similar to that of Menander’s *Adelphoi* and Terence’s *Adelphoe*<sup>32</sup>, which revolve around two pairs of characters: two old men and two young men. However, none of the sources explicitly, or even implicitly, linked to Menander’s *Hypobolimaïos* present a young man other than the supposititious son, and Spalding’s explanation of the alternative title *Agroikos* remains entirely convincing.

The rustic nature of the *hypobolimaïos* appears to be one of the central themes, along with the conflict between the natural father and the foster father over the youth’s education, as suggested by the Naples relief and the Geneva cameo. I propose that these two iconographic sources be considered as potential witnesses to Menander’s *Hypobolimaïos*, alongside the silver cup from the Boscoreale treasure. In contrast, the texts of Varro and Cicero should be regarded as uncertain or questionable sources.

---

<sup>31</sup> WEBSTER 1956, 79-80, who suggested the identification of the mask held by the skeleton with the rustic of Menander’s *Hypobolimaïos*. HERON DE VILLEFOSSE (1899, 65) described the same mask as “un masque de jeune femme aux cheveux frisés, mais aux traits vulgaires”; see also SCHEFOLD 1943, 166-167.

<sup>32</sup> See Skutsch 1899, 1191.

## Bibliography

- ARNOTT 1996 = W.G. Arnott, *Alexis. The Fragments: A Commentary*, Cambridge 1996.
- BERNABÒ BREA 1981 = L. Bernabò Brea, *Menandro e il teatro greco nelle terracotte liparesi*, Genova 1981.
- BREIN 1972 = F. Brein, *ΕΓΩ Δ' ΑΓΡΟΙΚΟΣ*, "WS" 6 (1972), 226-234.
- BROWN 2016 = P. Brown, *Greek Comedy at Rome*, in B. van Zyl Smit (ed.), *A Handbook to the Reception of Greek Drama*, Chichester 2016, 63-77.
- BRUZZESE 2011 = L. Bruzzese, *Studi su Filemone*, Lecce/Brescia 2011.
- CORBATO 1965 = C. Corbato, *Studi menandrei*, Udine 1965.
- Duckworth 1994 = G.E. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy. A Study in Popular Entertainment*, Norman 1994<sup>2</sup> (1952<sup>1</sup>).
- EDMONDS 1961 = J.M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, III B, Leiden 1961.
- FAIDER 1908 = P. Faider, *Le poète comique Cécilius. Sa vie et son œuvre*, "Le Musée Belge" 12.4 (1908), 269-341.
- FRASSINETTI 1979 = P. Frassinetti, *Cecilio Stazio e Menandro*, in *Studi di poesia latina in onore di Antonio Traglia*, I, Roma 1979, 77-86.
- FRESE 1956 = J.H. Freese, *Cicero. The speeches*, London/Cambridge (Mass.) 1956.
- GAISER 1988 = K. Gaiser, *La commedia sul rilievo marmoreo di Napoli*, "RAAN" 61 (1987-1988), 167-190.
- GRAUERT 1833 = W.H. Grauert, *Historische und Philologische Analekten*, Münster 1833.
- GREEN 1985 = J.R. Green, *Drunk Again: A Study in the Iconography of the Comic Theatre*, "AJA" 89.3 (1985), 465-472.
- GUARDÌ 1974 = T. Guardì, *Cecilio Stazio. I frammenti*, Palermo 1974.
- HANDLEY 1965 = E.W. Handley, *The Dyskolos of Menander*, London 1965.
- HERON DE VILLEFOSSE 1899 = A. Héron de Villefosse, *Le trésor de Boscoreale*, "Monuments et mémoires de la Fondation Eugène Piot" 5.1-2 (1899), 7-132.
- HOOPER/ASH 1934 = W.D. Hooper, H.B. Ash, *Marcus Porcius Cato: On Agriculture. Marcus Terentius Varro: On Agriculture*, London/Cambridge (Mass.) 1934.
- HUNTER 1985 = R.L. Hunter, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*, Cambridge 1985.
- KASSEL/AUSTIN 1983 = R. Kassel, C. Austin, *Poetae comici Graeci*, IV, Berlin/New York 1983.
- KASSEL/AUSTIN 1998 = R. Kassel, C. Austin, *Poetae comici Graeci*, VI/2, Berlin/New York 1998.
- KOCK 1888 = Th. Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*, III, Lipsiae 1888.
- KOERTE/THIERFELDER 1959 = A. Koerte, A. Thierfelder, *Menandri quae supersunt*, II, Lipsiae 1959.

- KOKOLAKIS 1962= M. Kokolakis, Ὁ Υποβολιμαῖος τοῦ Μενάνδρου, “Αθηνᾶ” 66 (1962), 9-114.
- KONSTANTAKOS 2000 = I. Konstantakos, *A Commentary on the Fragments of Eight Plays of Antiphanes*, diss. Cambridge 2000.
- MEINEKE 1823 = A. Meineke, *Menandri et Philemonis reliquiae*, Berolini 1823.
- MEINEKE 1840 = A. Meineke, *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*, III: *Fragmenta poetarum comoediae mediae*, Berolini 1840.
- MEINEKE 1841 = A. Meineke, *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*, IV: *Fragmenta poetarum comoediae novae*, Berolini 1841.
- MOUNTFORD 1934 = J.F. Mountford, *The Scholia Bembina*, London 1934.
- RAPISARDA 1939 = E. Rapisarda, *Filemone comico*, Milano/Messina 1939.
- RIBBECK 1855 = O. Ribbeck, *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta*, II: *Comicorum Romanorum praeter Plautum et Terentium reliquiae*, Lipsiae 1855.
- RIBBECK 1888 = O. Ribbeck, *Agroikos. Eine ethologische Studie*, “Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Klasse der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften” 10 (1888), 1-68.
- RIBBECK 1898 = O. Ribbeck, *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta*, II: *Comicorum Romanorum praeter Plautum et Syri quae feruntur sententias fragmenta*, Lipsiae 1898<sup>3</sup>.
- RITSCHL 1845 = F. Ritschl, *Parerga zu Plautus und Terenz*, I, Berlin 1845 (rist. Amsterdam 1965).
- RUSSELL 2001 = D.A. Russell, *Quintilian. The orator’s education. Books 1-2*, Cambridge (Mass.)/London 2001.
- SCHEFOLD 1943 = K. Schefold, *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker*, Basel 1943.
- SKUTSCH 1899 = O. Skutsch, *Caecilius* (25), “RE” 3 (1899), 1189-1192.
- SIMON 1938 = A.K.H. Simon, *Comicae tabellae*, Emsdetten 1938.
- SPALDING 1798 = G.L. Spalding, *M. Fabii Quintiliani de institutione oratoria libri duodecim*, I: *Continens libros I-III*, Lipsiae 1798.
- STAMA 2014 = F. Stama, *Alessi. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Castrovillari 2014.
- STANGL 1912 = Th. Stangl, *Ciceronis orationum scholiastae*, Wien 1912 (rist. Hildesheim 1964).
- TERZAGHI 1912 = N. Terzaghi, *Fabula. Prolegomeni allo studio del teatro antico*, I: *Questioni teatrali*, Milano/Palermo/Napoli 1912.
- TRAINA 1974 = A. Traina, *Vortit barbare. Le traduzioni poetiche da Livio Andronico a Cicerone*, Roma 1974<sup>2</sup> (1970<sup>1</sup>).
- TURNER 1962 = E.G. Turner, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri 27: 2452-2480*, London 1962.
- WARMINGTON 1935 = E.H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin*, I: *Ennius and Caecilius*, London/Cambridge (Mass.) 1935.

WEBSTER 1949 = T.B.L. Webster, *The Masks of Greek Comedy*, "Bulletin of the John Rylands Library" 32 (1949), 97-133.

WEBSTER 1950 = T.B.L. Webster, *Studies in Menander*, Manchester 1950.

WEBSTER 1956 = T.B.L. Webster, *Greek Theatre Production*, London 1956.

WEBSTER 1969 = T.B.L. Webster, *Monuments illustrating New Comedy*, London 1969<sup>2</sup> (1961<sup>1</sup>).

WEBSTER 1974 = T.B.L. Webster, *An Introduction to Menander*, Bristol 1974.

ZUNTZ 1956 = G. Zuntz, *Interpretation of a Menander Fragment* (Fr. 416 Koerte = 481 Kock), "Proceedings of the British Academy" 42 (1956), 209-246.

**Abstract:** In this paper, I discuss several literary and iconographic sources related to Menander's *Hypobolimaïos*. I compare the texts of Varro and Cicero, which refer to Caecilius' *Hypobolimaëus* (*Chaerestratus*), with Quintilian's text concerning the Menandrian play. Furthermore, I argue that a marble relief in Naples, a cameo in Geneva, and the decoration of a silver cup from the Boscoreale treasure can be associated with Menander's *Hypobolimaïos*.



Fig. 1



Fig. 2



Fig. 3